

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498  
Serial No.: 10/518,570  
Office Action dated: 10/25/07  
Response dated: 03/25/08

PATENT  
PD020056

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 25 2008

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This responds to the Office Action dated October 25, 2007.

Claim 1 has been amended. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in the specification, for example, at page 5, lines 13-33 and page 9, line 37 to page 10, line 14. No new matter has been added, and entry of the amendment to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,505,255 Akatsu et al. (Akatsu) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,940,387 Humpleman (Humpleman), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0163126 to Phillips (Phillips), and newly cited U.S. Patent 7,139,728 to Rigole (Rigole).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As an initial matter, Applicant wishes to note that the Examiner has acknowledged that the combination of Akatsu, Humpleman, and Phillips does not teach or suggest the features recited in claims 1-12 set forth in the previous Amendment. See Office Action, page 5. The Examiner cites to Rigole as providing a new ground of rejection based on the combination of Rigole with previously cited Akatsu, Humpleman, and Phillips. However, as set forth below, the combination of Rigole with Akatsu, Humpleman, and Phillips does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in the claims as presented herein, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-12 is respectfully requested.

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 as amended recites, among other features, a "module for search and integration of data for devices in a home network," "the home network having a plurality of individual devices which are connected to one another and communicate among one another via one or more protocols defined for the home network," "the module being able to receive

**CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**  
**Serial No.: 10/518,570**  
**Office Action dated: 10/25/07**  
**Response dated: 03/25/08**

**PATENT**  
**PD020056**

requests for data of the external network from at least one device not capable of independently requesting data of the external network, the request being in a format according to the one or more protocols defined for the home network.”

Applicant respectfully submits that at least these features of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by any of Akatsu, Humpleman, Phillips, and Rigole, either alone or in combination.

Claim 1 as amended herein recites the features presented in claim 1 as previously amended, plus the additional features set forth above. As noted above, the Examiner acknowledges that the combination of Akatsu, Humpleman, and Phillips did not describe all of the features in claim 1 set forth in the previous Amendment. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that those references also do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1 as amended herein.

Applicant further respectfully submits that Rigole also does not describe the features of claim 1 as amended herein. Rigole describes an interchange party computer system (IPCS) that “may include or be associated with *a computer system that includes a Services Search Module 2.03(e).*” Rigole at col. 14, lines 11-12. Rigole further describes the program modules 2.03, of which the Services Search Module 2.03(e) is one, as being “included in one or more participating party *computer systems*” and that preferably the modules are “included in or otherwise directly associated with IPCS 2.” Col. 10, lines 48-55. Rigole further describes that the “Module allows consumers to search for services that are not represented on the system site. The consumer enters certain descriptors or ‘keywords’ and then initiates a search. The search results are listed in order of relevance. This feature would normally be provided to consumers for free and powered by one of the many available search engines such as AltaVista, Yahoo!, Excite, or by a custom developed search engine.” Rigole at col. 14, lines 13-21.

Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would understand from this description in Rigole that the communication between the consumer computers and the external sites via the Services Search Module is conducted by means of IP protocol communications. One skilled in the art would further understand that in order to receive communications from such search engines as described in Rigole, a consumer computer must have an Internet browser, such as Internet Explorer® or Firefox®, that is installed on the

**CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**  
**Serial No.: 10/518,570**  
**Office Action dated: 10/25/07**  
**Response dated: 03/25/08**

**PATENT**  
**PD020056**

consumer computer and that produces a corresponding menu for searching according to keywords or other descriptors.

This contrasts with the module recited in claim 1 herein, which is able to "receive requests for data of the external network from at least one device not capable of independently requesting data of the external network, the request being in a format according to the one or more protocols defined for the home network" and "receive at least one of data and metadata describing the content of the data available at the at least one data provider in the external network and to make the data and metadata available to the at least one device in the format according to the one or more protocols defined for the home network." Thus, the module as claimed herein can receive requests for data of an external network from a device that cannot independently request that data, the request being in a dedicated format according to a home network protocol, and then, after receiving the results of a search for that data in an external network, can process those search results and make them available to the requesting device in the same dedicated format. Applicant respectfully submits that this is not taught or suggested by Rigole, alone or in combination with any of Akatsu, Humpleman, and Phillips.

In addition, although Akatsu describes a home gateway for communication between an external network and an internal IEEE 1394 network wherein a data stream is received at the home gateway in a first format and reformatted to a second format and sent to its destination in the internal network, Akatsu does not, however, describe communication between an external network and a home network using a module as recited herein. In Akatsu, the home gateway does not facilitate requests for data of the external network from devices that cannot make such requests on their own, the requests being in a format according to a protocol defined for the home network. Instead, in Akatsu, the home gateway merely receives data that is in one standard format (IP protocol format) and reformats it into another format (IEEE 1394 format) for use by devices in the network, or vice versa. Thus, Akatsu does not describe the data reformatting feature as recited in claim 1 herein.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over any of Akatsu, Humpleman, Phillips, and Rigole, either alone or in any combination. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and allowance is respectfully requested.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498  
Serial No.: 10/518,570  
Office Action dated: 10/25/07  
Response dated: 03/25/08

PATENT  
PD020056

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 25 2008

Claims 2-12

Claims 2-12 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. As discussed above, the cited combination of Akatsu, Humpleman, Phillips, and Rigole does not describe all of the features recited in claim 1, and therefore, the cited combination also does not describe all of the features recited in claims 2-12, both for the reasons discussed above and in view of the additional inventive features recited in those claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all of dependent claims 2-12 also are allowable over the cited art, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance with claims 1-12, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at 609-734-6440.

Respectfully submitted,

Ralf Köhler

CAF:pdf

Thomson Licensing LLC  
Patent Operations  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

March 25, 2008

By:

Catherine A. Ferguson

Catherine A. Ferguson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 40,877  
609/734-6440